

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/004030

International filing date (day/month/year)
02.03.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
03.03.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06K17/00, G06K1/18, G06K19/07

Applicant
CASIO COMPUTER CO., LTD.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☐ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Schauler, M

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7394



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITYInternational application No.
PCT/JP2005/004030**10/ 551 947****Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
- ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
- a. type of material:
- ☐ a sequence listing
- ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
- b. format of material:
- ☐ in written format
- ☐ in computer readable form
- c. time of filing/furnishing:
- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Re Item V.

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1 : WO 01/20564 A (ORDICAM RECHERCHE ET DEVELOPPEMENT SA;
MICHOT, GERARD) 22 March 2001 (2001-03-22)

D2 : US 4 703 347 A (YASUDA ET AL) 27 October 1987 (1987-10-27)

D3 : US 6 371 375 B1 (ACKLEY H. SPRAGUE ET AL) 16 April 2002 (2002-04-16)

2 Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):
An apparatus ("scanner" (2)) for taking an image (8) of a person and writing the captured image to an electronic tag (30). According to the standards for tag-reader communication, at least some ID-information has to be read from the tag before starting to write to the tag.

2.1 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

As can be seen from the above, document D1 discloses in combination all the features defined in independent claim 1. Hence the subject-matter of this claim is not new (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 4

As can be seen from the above, document D1 discloses in combination all the features defined in independent claim 4. Hence the subject-matter of this claim is not new (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.3 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 5

D1 discloses a tag-reading apparatus comprising a screen for displaying the picture that is stored in the tag (cf page 5, lines 21-30). Hence the subject-matter of this claim is not new (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.4 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 9

As can be seen from the document D1 (cf figure 1), the apparatus is a computer running a software for implementing the method of taking images and reading or writing to a tag. Hence the subject-matter of this claim is not new (Article 33(2) PCT).

- 3 Documents D2 and D3 disclose an apparatus for taking picture and writing the information to an electronic tag. Hence, the subject-matter of claims 1,4,5, and 9 is not new (Article 33(2) PCT).
4. The other dependent claims merely define straightforward embodiments and possibilities from which the skilled person would select, in accordance with the circumstances, without exercise of inventive skill, in order to solve the problem posed. Most of this additional features are disclosed or suggested by the prior art at hand. Moreover the description does not make clear what specific advantages these additional features might imply. Therefore these claims add nothing inventive.